



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/655,717	09/05/2003	Peiguang Zhou	KCC-19188	8792

7590 09/22/2005

Melanie I. Rauch  
Pauley Petersen & Erickson  
Suite 365  
2800 West Higgins Road  
Hoffman Estates, IL 60195

EXAMINER
----------

KRUER, KEVIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1773

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/655,717

Applicant(s)

ZHOU, PEIGUANG

Examiner

Kevin R. Kruer

Art Unit

1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-35 and 44-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-35 and 44-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 December 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/21/05; 2/28/05.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☒ Other: 10/04; 3/04; 1/04.

Art Unit: 1773

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Election/Restriction**

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in the reply filed on May 4, 2005 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the examiner gave no grounds for the restriction. The examiner concurs. Claims 33-35 will be examined with the invention of Group I.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The examiner acknowledges the receipt of 5 information disclosure statements. Said information disclosure statements have been fully considered and initialed copies of said IDS are enclosed herein.

### ***Drawings***

3. The drawings filed December 23, 2002 are accepted.

### ***Double Patenting***

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 18-35 and 44-65 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,872,784 in view of WO 02/053688 (herein referred to as Kimberly Clark).

Patent '784 claims the adhesive claimed in the pending claims. Patent '784 does not teach the claimed laminate structure. However, Kimberly Clark teaches the claimed structural limitations of pending claims 18-35 and 44-65. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the laminates taught in Kimberly Clark utilizing the adhesive claimed in Patent '784. The motivation for doing so would have been that said composition is taught to be suitable for use in absorbent articles.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 18-35 and 44-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 02/053668 (herein referred to as Zhou) in view of Lakshmann et al (US 4,857,594).

Zhou teaches a laminate structure comprising a first and second facing layers and an adhesive comprising selected ratios of crystalline and atactic polyolefin (abstract). The atactic polymer has a degree of crystallinity of below 20% (page 4, lines

Art Unit: 1773

24+) and the crystalline polymer has a crystallinity of 40% or greater (page 6, lines 1+). The first and second layers may comprise non-woven materials. Alternatively, the two substrates may comprise a single sheet (page 7). The laminate preferably has a static peel failure time of at least 8 hours (claim 26) and a relative accretion value of less than 0.2 (claim 30).

Zhou teaches all the claim limitations with the exception of the addition of an elastomeric base polymer to the adhesive. However, Lakshmanan teaches the addition of a selectively hydrogenated block copolymer to an amorphous polyolefin adhesive (abstract) in order to improve its adhesion to polyolefin substrates (col 1, lines 48+). The block copolymer may comprise SEBS or SIS (col 3, lines 59+). The styrene content is 5-50wt% (col 4, lines 13+). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add sufficient amounts of such block copolymers to the adhesive taught in Zhou such that the adhesive has improved adhesion to polyolefin substrates.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin R. Kruer whose telephone number is 571-272-1510. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on 571-272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1773

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K R K' with a horizontal line extending from the end.

Kevin R. Kruer  
Patent Examiner-Art Unit 1773